1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT (OF THE STATE OF OREGON
10	FOR THE COUNTY	Y OF MULTNOMAH
11	JEREMY LATHROP,) Case No.
12	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT
13	v.	Personal Injury – Strict Products Liability Necligance Employers' Liability Law
14	WABASH NATIONAL CORPORATION, a Foreign Corporation; TEC EQUIPMENT,	 Negligence – Employers' Liability Law – Negligence <i>Per Se</i> (Oregon Safe Employment Act)
15	INC. dba TEC EQUIPMENT, an Oregon Corporation; and FEDEX CORPORATION,)
16	a Foreign Corporation;) Amount in Controversy: \$2,870,000.00) (Demand for Jury Trial)
17	Defendants.) (Not Subject to Mandatory Arbitration)
18	Plaintiff alleges:	
19		M FOR RELIEF
20	. •	bash National Corporation NT ONE
21		ducts Liability)
22		1.
23	At all times material hereto:	
24		a citizen of the state of Oregon, and was
25	corporation, at the FedEx Freigh	Inc. ("FEDEX FREIGHT"), an Arkansas t facility located at 750 N.E. Fazio Way, city
26	of Portland, county of Multnom	an, state of Oregon;
Page 1	- COMPLAINT	

1	b)	Defendant Wabash National Corporation ("WABASH") was a duly organized Delaware corporation, with a principal place of business located
2		at 1000 Sagamore Parkway, S., city of Lafayette, county of Tippecanoe, state of Indiana, doing business as a manufacturer, distributor, servicer and
3		seller of truck trailers and related types of equipment, some of which were
4		sold, leased or rented to customers within the state of Oregon;
5	c)	Defendant TEC Equipment, Inc. dba TEC Equipment ("TEC") was a duly
6		organized Oregon corporation, authorized to do business and doing business within the state of Oregon as an authorized Wabash trailer dealer,
7		also providing trailer maintenance and trailer service to owners of Wabash trailers;
8	d)	Defendant TEC carried on regular and sustained business activity within
9		Multnomah Couny by maintaining a principal place of business at 750 N.E. Columbia Boulevard, in the city of Portland, county of Multnomah,
10		state of Oregon, and by also maintaining an office for trailer sales, maintenance and service located at 9400 N.E. Vancouver Way in the city
11		of Portland, county of Multnomah, state of Oregon;
12	e)	Defendant FedEx Corporation ("FEDEX") was a Delaware corporation
13		authorized to do business and doing business as the parent company of FedEx Freight, as well as other FedEx entities, with a principal place of business located at 942 South Shady Grove Road, in the city of Memphis,
14		county of Shelby, state of Tennessee.
15		2.
16	Defendant Wabash was the seller and/or lessor of a 2012 Wabash 8-foot Dry Van Duraplate	
17	trailer (the "TRAILER"), with a Vehicle Identification Number ("VIN") of 1JJV482D1CL718076.	
18	The Trailer was manufactured, tested, inspected, sold and/or leased, and distributed by defendant	
19	Wabash. The Trailer was designed in such a way so that the small step on the trailer's right side	
20	was affixed v	with a bolt, that could loosen over time, rather than being affixed with a bracket, which
21	was a more p	ermanent type of attachment, or being welded in place.
22		3.
23	Defen	dant TEC, as the authorized dealer of Wabash trailers in the Portland area, carried out
24	service and n	naintenance activities on the Trailer, subsequent to its initial sale or lease in 2012 to
25	FedEx Freigh	ıt.
26	///	
Page 2	- COMPLAINT	

1	4.
2	On or about September 28, 2018, plaintiff was working within the course and scope of his
3	employment as a truck driver for FedEx Freight. Mr. Lathrop was driving a tractor with the Trailer
4	attached to it, carrying packages to be delivered to FedEx Freight's customers. Plaintiff was unsure
5	of one of the addresses on one of the packages, so he pulled into the parking lot at the Swan Island
6	McDonald's, located at 3110 N. Going Street, city of Portland, county of Multnomah, state of
7	Oregon. Plaintiff went to the back of the trailer to verify the address, because it appeared to be
8	inaccurate. Plaintiff was able to enter the rear of the Trailer without difficulty and pulled the sheets
9	off the pallet to determine the correct address, which he then verified.
10	5.
11	As plaintiff was attempting to exit the rear of the trailer, with his left hand holding the
12	accordion Trailer door tether and his right hand on the trailer frame, plaintiff placed his right foot on
13	the small step on the Trailer's right side. As he pulled down and stepped his left foot from the
14	Trailer bed to the painted Trailer bumper, the small step wobbled, and lurched forward, causing
15	plaintiff to lose his balance and fall forward toward the Trailer, the direction in which he was facing.
16	Plaintiff caught himself with his right hand on the Trailer bed. The accordion door, which was
17	spring-loaded, came down hard and fast, crushing plaintiff's right hand.
18	6.
19	Plaintiff thereafter sought medical attention, and reported his injury to FedEx Freight's
20	Operations Manager, who determined the cause of the injury was equipment failure. FedEx Freight
21	sent the Trailer to a mechanic and had the bolt on the step tightened.
22	7.
23	The Trailer on which plaintiff was injured, was in substantially the same condition at the
24	time of its use on September 28, 2018 as it was at the time of its manufacture, distribution, and sale
25	by defendant Wabash to FedEx Freight.
26	
Page 3	- COMPLAINT

1		8.
2	Defen	dant Wabash knew, or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, of the
3	risk and dang	er created by failing to provide a proper means and method of affixing the right rear
4	step on the b	ack of the Trailer in such a manner so that it would not become loose over time and
5	create a pote	ntial hazard. This was a reasonably foreseeable and unreasonably dangerous risk of
6	harm, due to	the nature of the use of these type of trailers by operators, who will be required to enter
7	and exit the t	railer many times a day. It was reasonably foreseeable that the bolt that was used to
8	affix the step	s to the rear of the Trailer would become loose over time and would permit the step to
9	wobble or mo	ove when a user of the Trailer stepped on it.
10		9.
11	Defer	adant Wabash is strictly liable for manufacturing, designing, inspecting, testing, and
12	selling the Tr	railer in an unreasonably dangerous and defective condition for the use intended, and
13	not within the expectations of a reasonable consumer in one or more of the following particulars:	
14 15	a)	The Trailer was defective and unreasonably dangerous because it did not have a securely fastened right rear step. The step was fastened with bolts that did not have good locking washers or nuts, and would become loose over time, and create the potential for unexpected wobble of the step. An
16		alternate design would be to weld the step in place;
17	b)	The Trailer was defective and unreasonably dangerous because it did not utilize a stable method of affixing the rear step, but rather utilized bolts that
18		would become loose with time, after foreseeable use of the trailer, which frequently moved back, up against, and into objects, such as loading docks,
19		many times during a typical work day;
20	c)	The Trailer was defective and unreasonably dangerous because it did not contain adequate warnings, in the Operator's Manual and in decals
21		prominently displayed on the Trailer itself, about the need for inspecting steps and handles and tightening the bolts on a periodic basis, because they
22		could become damaged over time, and present the potential risk of unanticipated movement when a user was entering or exiting the Trailer,
23		when defendant Wabash knew, or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, of the reasonably foreseeable and unreasonably dangerous risk
24		of harm that the step would not remain secure, and could move when a user was attempting to enter or exit the Trailer, creating the risk of a fall and/or an
25		event where the automatic door came down unexpectedly because of the weight shift of the user;

Page 4 – COMPLAINT

26

1	d)	In failing to adequately inspect the Trailer prior to its initial sale, which adequate inspection would have indicated the defects set forth in ¶9(a)
2		through (c) above;
3	e)	In failing to adequately test the Trailer prior to its initial sale, which adequate testing would have indicated the defects set forth in ¶9(a) through (c) above.
4		testing would have indicated the defects set forth in \(\psi\)/(a) through (c) above.
5		10.
6	The ne	egligence, fault, and strict liability of defendants, and each of them, in one or more of
7	the particulars	set forth herein, was a substantial factor in causing, contributing to, and/or enhancing
8	the following	injuries, many of which are permanent in nature:
9	a)	Traumatic crush injury;
10	b)	Right third digit proximal phalanx fracture;
11	c)	Non-union right fifth metacarpal neck fracture;
12	d)	Extensor tendon injury at the level of the fifth proximal interphalangeal
13		joint ("PIP") without retraction;
14	e)	Puncture wound in palm of right hand;
15	f)	Pin tract infection following surgery;
16	g)	Pain in fingers in right hand;
17	h)	Ligamentous injuries related to the crush injury to the right hand.
18		11.
19	As a	result of the aforementioned injuries, plaintiff underwent the following surgical
20	procedures:	
21	a)	Open reduction and internal fixation of the right fifth metacarpal neck
22		fracture;
23	b)	Closed reduction with percutaneous pinning fixations of the right third digit
24		proximal phalanx fracture;
25	c)	Radiological x-rays taking multiple views of the right hand;
26	d)	Subsequent removal of pins.

Page 5 - COMPLAINT

1	12.
2	As a result of the negligence, fault, and/or strict liability the defendants, and each of them, in
3	one of more of the particulars set forth herein, plaintiff incurred pain and suffering, loss of
4	enjoyment of life, interference with normal activities, entitling him to an award of noneconomic
5	damages in a reasonable amount, to be awarded by the jury, not to exceed the sum of
6	\$2,500,000.00.
7	13.
8	As a result of the negligence, fault, and/or strict liability the defendants, and each of them, in
9	one of more of the particulars set forth herein, plaintiff has incurred reasonable medical, hospital,
10	doctor, therapy, nursing, and rehabilitation expenses to date in the approximate sum of \$90,000.00,
11	and has lost wages to date in the approximate sum of \$130,000.00. Plaintiff will incur future
12	medical and related expenses in the approximate sum of \$50,000.00, and future lost wages and
13	employee benefits and/or loss of future earning capacity in the approximate sum of \$100,000.00, all
14	to his total economic damage in the approximate sum of \$370,000.00.
15	14.
16	Plaintiff is entitled to pre-judgment interest at the legal rate of 9% per annum for his
17	economically verifiable losses from the date of loss to the date of entry of judgment herein.
18	15.
19	Plaintiff reserves the right to amend his complaint at the time of trial to more completely
20	allege his economic losses and/or to conform to proof offered at trial.
21	16.
22	Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial.
23	
24	
25	
26	

Page 6 - COMPLAINT

1	COUNT TWO
2	(Negligence)
3	17.
4	Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein ¶¶1 through 16 of Count One of his First Claim
5	for Relief.
6	18.
7	Defendant Wabash, acting independently and through its employees, was negligent in
8	one or more of the respects alleged in ¶9.
9	19.
10	The negligence of defendant Wabash, in one or more of the particulars set forth herein,
11	was a substantial factor in causing plaintiff to suffer injuries, undergo surgeries, and incur
12	damages as set forth in ¶¶10 through 14 of Count One of his First Claim for Relief.
13	SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF
14	(Against Defendant TEC Equipment, Inc. dba TEC Equipment) (Negligence)
15	20.
16	Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein ¶¶1 through 8 and 10 through 16 of Count One
17	of his First Claim for Relief.
18	21.
19	At all material times, defendant TEC acted by and through its authorized employees and
20	agents, who were acting within the course and scope of their employment and/or agency
21	relationships.
22	22.
23	Defendant TEC, as the authorized Wabash dealer in the Portland area, performed
24	maintenance and service activities on the Trailer.
25	///
26	///
Page 7	- COMPLAINT

1	23.	
2	Defe	ndant TEC, acting independently and/or by and through its employees, was
3	negligent in one or more of the following particulars:	
4	a)	In failing to identify loose bolts, add lock washers, and tighten the bolts on
5		the right step on the rear of the trailer, thereby causing plaintiff to lose his balance and suffer injury, as previously described herein with greater
6		particularity in ¶5;
7	b)	In failing to replace the screws with a bracket system or adding lock
8		washers that would more efficiently stabilize the step, and make it less susceptible to becoming unstable over time;
9	c)	In failing to warn FedEx Freight of the potential risk or danger of the instability of the step because the bolts could come loose over time, at a
10		time when defendant TEC knew, or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, that it was an unreasonably dangerous and reasonably
11		foreseeable risk of harm that the step would no longer be effectively secured, and would cause someone to lose their balance while entering or
12		exiting the Trailer.
13		24.
14	The r	negligence of defendant TEC, in one or more of the particulars set forth herein, was a
15	substantial factor in causing plaintiff to suffer injuries, undergo surgeries, and incur damages as	
16	set forth in ¶¶10 through 14 of Count One of his First Claim for Relief.	
17	THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Against Defendant FedEx Corporation)	
18	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
19	COUNT ONE (Negligence)	
20		25.
21	Plain	tiff realleges and incorporates herein ¶¶1 through 8 and 10 through 16 of Count One
22	of his First C	Claim for Relief.
23		26.
24	At all material times, defendant FedEx acted by and through its authorized agents and	
25	employees, v	who were individually acting within the course and scope of their employment.
26	///	
Page 8	COMPLAINT	

1		27.
2	Defen	dant FedEx, as the parent corporation, was engaged in a common enterprise with its
3	subsidiary, F	edEx Freight, plaintiff's employer, at the facility located on N.E. Fazio Way in
4	Portland. De	fendant FedEx exercised actual control over the facility, retained the right to control
5	the facility,	and/or supervised FedEx Freight's performance and the performance of FedEx
6	Freight's emp	ployees at the facility.
7		28.
8	Defen	dant FedEx was in charge of and had care, custody and control over the work
9	activity perfe	ormed by plaintiff with his trailer after receiving a load at the facility, and
10	promulgated policies with respect thereto.	
11		29.
12	Defen	dant FedEx knew, or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, prior to
13	plaintiff's inj	ury, that injuries while entering or exiting the rear of trailers are a significant source
14	of workplace	injuries for individuals operating delivery vehicles for FedEx Freight, as well as
15	defendant FedEx's other subsidiaries, including FedEx Ground Package System, Inc. dba FedEx	
16	Ground. Despite this knowledge or imputed knowledge, defendant FedEx did not discuss with	
17	plaintiff, or his supervisors at FedEx Freight, particular safety issues surrounding entering and	
18	exiting trailers, such as the Wabash Trailer that plaintiff was using on the date of his injury.	
19		30.
20	Defer	ndant FedEx was negligent in one or more of the following particulars:
21	a)	In failing to require that the bolts on the Trailer's right rear step be
22		tightened on a regular basis;
23	b)	In failing to require regular service and maintenance on the Trailer that
24		included tightening the bolts on the Trailer's right rear step;
25	c)	In failing to require that the bolts on the Trailer's right rear step be
26	6	replaced with lock washers, redesigned with a bracket system or welded, which would stabilize the step;

 $Page \ 9-COMPLAINT$

1	1 d) In failing to require that FedEx Freight employ trailers for potential hazards, such as loose bol-	
2	part of their daily work activities;	is on the light real step, as
3	training of all workers at the facility in hazard	
4	provention	
5		
6	The negligence of defendant FedEx, in one or more	of the particulars set forth herein,
7	7 was a substantial factor in causing plaintiff to suffer injur	ies, undergo surgeries, and incur
8	8 damages as set forth in ¶10 through 14 of Count One of his Fi	irst Claim for Relief.
9	COUNTING	
10	(Employers' Liability Law) (General Duty Not Based on Safety	
11	32.	
12	Plaintiff realleges ¶¶1 through 8 and 10 through 16 of	f Count One of his First Claim for
13	Relief, and ¶26 through 30 of Count One of Plaintiff's Third	Claim for Relief.
14	14 33.	
15	At all times plaintiff was acting in the course and cope of	of his employment by FedEx Freight
16	16 as a truck driver.	
17	17 34.	
18	18 At all material times, there was in full force and	effect in the State of Oregon an
19	19 Employers' Liability Law ("ELL") which provided in pertinen	at part as follows:
20	ORS 654.305. Generally, all owners, contractor	ors or subcontractors
21	and other persons having charge of, or respons	ibility for, any work
22	every device, care and precaution that is practi	icable to use for the
23	for preserving the efficiency of the structure	e, machine or other
	suitable material or safety appliance and device	
24		
	25 ///	
26	26 ///	

Page 10 - COMPLAINT

1		35.
2	At all	material times herein, defendant FedEx, and its employees, were in charge of and
3	responsible f	for the work involving the risk or danger to plaintiff, to other employees, and/or to
4	members of t	he general public.
5		36.
6	Defer	ndant FedEx had control of the work being done, and/or retained the right to
7	control the	work, and/or was engaged in a common enterprise with plaintiff's employer,
8	defendant Fe	dEx Freight.
9		37.
10	Defer	ndant FedEx failed to use every device, care, or precaution which was practical to
11	use for the p	protection and safety of plaintiff's life and limb, without regard to cost, in one or
12	the particular	rs set forth in ¶30 above together with the following additional particulars:
13 14	a)	In failing to require FedEx Freight to develop and/or implement a reasonable safety policy to train employees in safety procedures, including how to safely enter and exit the rear of the trailer when delivering packages;
15 16 17	b)	In failing to adopt inspection policies and procedures such that defendant FedEx could observe that FedEx Freight had no functioning system to prevent bolts from loosening on the rear steps of trailers, thereby creating a reasonably foreseeable and unreasonably dangerous hazard of a wobbly step;
18 19	c)	In failing to implement effective inspection procedures to determine compliance with defendant FedEx's safety and training programs.
20		38.
21	Defe	ndant FedEx's violations of the ELL, in one or more of the particulars set forth in
22	¶37 above, v	vere a substantial factor in causing the injuries to, medical treatment of, and damages
23	suffered by	plaintiff, as set forth above in ¶¶10 through 14 of Count One of his First Claim for
24	Relief.	
25	///	
26	///	

Page 11 - COMPLAINT

(503) 226-3628

1 2	COUNT THREE (Employers' Liability Law) (Specific Duty Based on Safety Codes)
3	39.
4	Plaintiff realleges ¶¶1 through 8 and 10 through 16 of Count One of his First Claim for
5	Relief, ¶¶26 through 30 of Count One of Plaintiff's Third Claim for Relief, and ¶¶34 through 37
6	of Count Two of Plaintiff's Third Claim for Relief.
7	40.
8	At all material times there was in full force and effect in the State of Oregon the ELL
9	which provided in pertinent part as follows:
10	ORS 654.310. All owners, contractors, subcontractors, or persons
11	whatsoever, engaged in the construction, repairing, alteration, removal or painting of any building, bridge, viaduct or other structure, or in the
12	erection or operation of any machinery, or in the manufacture, transmission and use of electricity, or in the manufacture or use of any
13	dangerous appliance or substance, shall see that all places of employment are in compliance with every applicable order, decision,
14	direction, standard, rule or regulation made or prescribed by the Department of Consumer and Business Services pursuant to ORS
15	654.001 to 654.295, 654.412 to 654.423 and 654.750 to 654.780.
16	41.
17	At all material times herein, there were in full force and effect certain safety codes,
18	promulgated by the state of Oregon in the Oregon Revised Statutes ("ORS") and the Oregon
19	Administrative Rules ("OAR"), and by the federal government of the United States in the Code
20	of Federal Regulations ("CFR"). Defendant FedEx failed to comply with the following specific
21	requirements, in one or more of the following particulars:
22	a) ORS 654.010. Employers to furnish safe place of employment. Every employer shall furnish employment and a place of employment which
23	are safe and healthful for employees therein, and shall furnish and use such devices and safeguards, and shall adopt and use such practices,
24	means, methods, operations and processes as are reasonably necessary to render such employment and place of employment safe and healthful,
25	and shall do every other thing reasonably necessary to protect the life, safety and health of such employees.
26	safety and health of such employees.

Page 12 - COMPLAINT

Defendant FedEx violated the aforementioned safety code by failing to provide a safe			
place of employment in that bolts on the right rear step of the Trailer that plaintiff was using on			
September 28, 2018, became loose, thereby rendering the step unstable and creating a reasonably			
foreseeable and unreasonably dangerous risk of harm because of loss of balance while stepping			
on the loose step.			
b) 29 CFR §1926.20. General safety and health provisions. * * *			
(b) Accident prevention responsibilities.			
(1) It shall be the responsibility of the employer to initiate and maintain			
such programs as may be necessary to comply with this part.			
(2) Such programs shall provide for frequent and regular inspections of			
the job sites, materials, and equipment to be made by competent persons designated by the employers.			
Defendant FedEx violated the aforementioned safety code by failing to initiate and			
maintain a reasonable accident prevention policy, and by failing to provide for regular			
inspections of the bolts on the right rear step of the Trailer by competent persons.			
c) 29 CFR §1926.21 Safety training and education.			
* * *			
(b) Employer responsibility.			
8 * * *			
(2) The employer shall instruct each employee in the recognition and			
avoidance of unsafe conditions and the regulations applicable to his work environment to control or eliminate any hazards or other exposure			
work environment to control or eliminate any hazards or other exposure			
work environment to control or eliminate any hazards or other exposure			
work environment to control or eliminate any hazards or other exposure to illness or injury.			
work environment to control or eliminate any hazards or other exposure to illness or injury. Defendant FedEx violated the aforementioned safety code by failing to instruct each			
work environment to control or eliminate any hazards or other exposure to illness or injury. Defendant FedEx violated the aforementioned safety code by failing to instruct each employee, including plaintiff, in the recognition and avoidance of unsafe conditions, <i>i.e.</i> , that the			

Page 13 – COMPLAINT

1 2	d) In violating OAR 437-001-0760 (1), which requires all employers to use all means and methods necessary to safely accomplish all work where employees are exposed to a hazard;				
3					
4	•,	employment must be inspected by a qualified person or person as often as the type of operation, unsafe conditions found by these inspections must be			
5		replace, repaired, or remedied promptly;			
6	f)	In violating OAR 654.010, by failing to furnish a safe place of employment;			
7		employment,			
8	g)	In violating ORS 654.305, by failing to use every device, care and precaution that is practicable to use for the protection and safety of life and			
9		limb;			
10	h)	In violating OAR 437-003-0503, Training requirements, by failing to adequately train plaintiff and his supervisors with respect to the need to			
inspect and tighten, if loose, the bolts on the right rear step of the Trail					
12	42.				
13	Defendant FedEx did not use every device, care and precaution that is practical to use for				
14	the protection and safety of life and limb, limited only by the necessity for preserving the				
15	efficiency of the structure, machine, or other apparatus or device and without regard to additiona				
16	costs of suitable material or safety appliances or devices as required by ORS 654.305, by				
17	violating one or more of the safety codes set forth in ¶41.				
18	43.				
19	Defendant FedEx's violations of the ELL, in one or more of the particulars set forth in				
20	¶37 above, were a substantial factor in causing the injuries to, medical treatment of, and damages				
21	suffered by plaintiff, as set forth above in ¶¶10 through 14 of Count One of his First Claim for				
22	Relief.				
23	///				
24	///				
25	///				
26					

Page 14 – COMPLAINT

1	COUNT FOUR (Negligence <i>Per Se</i>)		
2	(Oregon Safe Employment Act)		
3	44.		
4	Plaintiff realleges ¶¶1 through 8 and 10 through 16 of Count One of his First Claim f		
5	Relief, ¶¶26 through 30 of Count One of Plaintiff's Third Claim for Relief, ¶¶34 through 37		
6	Count Two of Plaintiff's Third Claim for Relief, and ¶40 through 42 of Count Three of		
7	Plaintiff's Third Claim for Relief.		
8	45.		
9	The Trailer that plaintiff was using on September 28, 2018, was a "place of employment		
10	as defined in ORS 654.005(8), part of the Oregon Safe Employment Act ("OSEA"). The facility		
11	was a fixed structure where an employee worked temporarily or permanently, where a process,		
12	operation, or activity related, either directly or indirectly, to an employer's industry, trade		
13	business or occupation.		
14	46.		
15	Defendant FedEx was an owner, as that term is defined in ORS 654.005(6), in that it has		
16	ownership, control, and/or custody of the Trailer.		
17	47.		
18	Defendant FedEx was an employer, as that term is defined in ORS 654.005(6), in that		
19	they had one or more employees.		
20	48.		
21	Defendant FedEx violated the OSEA by failing to comply with the one or more of the		
22	specific requirements set forth in ¶41 above.		
23	49.		
24	Defendant FedEx's violations of the OSEA, in one or more of the particulars set forth in		
25	¶41 above, were a substantial factor in causing the injuries to, medical treatment of, and damages		
26	suffered by plaintiff, as set forth above in ¶¶10 through 14 of Count One of his First Claim.		

Page 15 – COMPLAINT

1	WHEREFORE plaintiff prays for judgment against defendants, and each of them, in the			
2	sum of \$2,870,000.00, for his costs and disbursements incurred herein, and for such other relief			
3	as the court deems just and equitable.			
4	DATED this 25 th day of September, 2020.			
5		Alaka,		
6		J. Randolph Pickett, OSB #721974		
7		R. Brendan Dummigan, OSB #932588 Kimberly O. Weingart, OSB #091407 Shangar S. Meman, OSB #171205		
8		Shangar S. Meman, OSB #171205 PICKETT DUMMIGAN MCCALL LLP		
9	dis.	of Attorneys for Plaintiff		
10				
11				
12				
13				
14		o .		
15	et a constant of the constant	a		
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				

Page 16 - COMPLAINT